

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

JASON LEE NIEMAN,

Plaintiff

v.

KEITH HALE, *et al.*,

Defendants

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12-CV-02433-L

Judge: Hon. Sam A. Lindsay

Magistrate Judge: Hon. David L. Horan

**DEFENDANT HALE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF NIEMAN'S MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND FACTS	4
III. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO NIEMAN'S COMPLAINT	9
A. Nieman's Motion fails to show that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact.....	10
B. Nieman's Motion relies on criticizing Hale's credibility	12
C. Nieman's Motion fails because its allegations are based upon suppositions and fiction	13
D. Nieman's Motion fails because it twists and distorts law and events	16
E. The U.S. Constitution fails to support Nieman's Motion	18
IV. PRAYER	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Pages
<i>Alston v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.</i> , 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6739, *27-28 (N.D.Cal. Feb. 14, 1994)	13
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 447 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)	3, 10
<i>Boudreaux v. Swift Transportation Co., Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 536, 540 (5 th Cir. 2005)	3
<i>Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway Co.</i> , 548 U.S. 53, 67 (2006)	5, 7, 10,16,17
<i>Castro v. Beecher</i> , 459 F. 2d 725 (CA1 1972)	6
<i>Chance v. Board of Examiners</i> , 458 F. 2d 1167 (CA2 1972)	6
<i>Cutting Underwater Technologies USA, Inc. v. Eni U.S. Operating Co.</i> , 671 F.3d 512, 515-16.	12
<i>Dias v. Goodman Mfg. L.P Co.</i> , 214 S.W.3d 672, 676 (Tex.App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 2007)	5, 16, 17
<i>Filar v. Bd. of Educ. of Chicago</i> , 526 F.3d 1054, 1063 (7th Cir. 2008)	11
<i>Forsythe v. Barr</i> , 19 F.3d 1527, 1533 (6 th Cir)	3
<i>Griggs v. Duke Power Co.</i> , 401 U. S. 424, 429 (1971)	6
<i>Highland Capital Management, LP v. Bank of America, National Association</i> 3:10-CV-1632-L, N.D. Tex, Doc 132 at 15	12
<i>Hill v. Potter</i> , 625 F. 3d 998 (7th Cir.2010)	11
<i>McCoy v. City of Shreveport</i> , 492 F.3d 551, 556-57 (5th Cir. 2007)	5, 16,17
<i>Quarles v. Philip Morris, Inc.</i> , 279 F. Supp. 505 (ED Va. 1968)	6
<i>Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc.</i> , 530 U.S. 133, 150 (2000)	3
<i>Springer v. Durflinger</i> , 518 F.3d 479, 484 (7th Cir.2008)	11

STATUTES AND RULES

Statutes and Rules	Page
Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(1)(3)	7
Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(1)	9
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)	1

N.D. Tex. L. Civ. R. 56.5(b)	1
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f)(1)	2
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 (d)(1)	2
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(g)	3
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56	10,12,16
Texas Labor Code § 21.055	5, 16
Texas Labor Code § 52.031(a)(b)(1)(2)	13, 16

DEFENDANT’S APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Document	Pages
3/25/2011 Email to Daniel Kennedy, RLI General Counsel, cc Keith Hale first revealing “protected activity”	1
Pages from Deposition of Jason Nieman, (deposed by Keith Hale)	2 – 11
Examples of Nieman not dissuaded from taking part in protected conduct	3-31
Current resume of Jason Nieman (first page)	32
Pages from Deposition of Paul Neir, (deposed by Jason Nieman)	33 - 35